

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 29, 2001 LB 664

lonely guy in the heart of the city, all along and forsaken, so my "no" vote will probably be the only one on the board. That's all I think I'll say at this time, Mr. President. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Chambers. On advancement of LB 664, Senator Bourne.

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you, Mr. President. Members, I disagree, respectfully disagree, with Senator Redfield. I think what we've done here is going to have a disastrous impact on the existing pool. We saw that happen in Kansas and I'm afraid that it's going to happen here. We had so much misinformation and I guess the bottom line is, is that I didn't do a good enough job articulating to you the danger of...of mixing unlike interests in groups, and I'm going to be with Senator Chambers and I'm not going to support the bill. And I kind of wished that I had changed my vote and so I could do a motion to reconsider, but I neglected to do that. I'm going to work on some amendments and we're going to...and do what we can to change this bill so that these 70,000 insureds' interests are protected. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Bourne. Senator Bromm, you are recognized to close on the advancement of LB 664.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Mr. President. I think we did have an excellent debate and, Senator Bourne, you're being too tough on yourself. You did all that could be done with what you had as a subject and a position. There...there simply is some misinformation. There has been some alarming information distributed. I went to three townhall meetings in my district last night. I had received a number of e-mails from teachers. One of the teachers that I had answered thanked us for furnishing additional information and had posted the response on the bulletin board of their school, and I think the teachers understood in that particular school that if this pooling concept were to be approached by their district that would be a matter of negotiations. It would be a matter that...that would be permissive. It is not forcing anyone to change their present carrier in any respect whatsoever. It does open up some opportunities for many of our governmental subdivisions to try to strengthen their purchasing power, to try to strengthen their